

Second, the product claims discussed above which require the use of a beam would, of necessity, have to be searched in class 264, subclass 2.5, the same as the process claims of Group I. There is, thus, no separate search.


Third, since an examination of the process and product claims would require a search be made in the same class and subclass, it would not be a serious burden on the Examiner to examine all the claims on the merits. The Examiner's attention is directed to the second paragraph of Section 803 of the MPEP, which states:

"If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions." (Emphasis added)

Lastly, the assignee of the instant application is a small entity with limited financial resources. The Patent Office fees and attorneys' fees required to prosecute a separate application would be unduly burdensome.

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn and an action be promptly issued on the merits of all the claims in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Sigalos, Reg. No. 19,043
Carillon Towers
13601 Preston Road, Suite 402W
Dallas, Texas 75240
Telephone: (972) 770-0024
Facsimile: (972) 770-0028

May 21, 2003